

Appl. No.: 09/592,309  
Amdt. dated: July 1, 2004  
Reply to final Office action of March 1, 2004

**PATENT**  
**Docket No. EPI-024 US**  
**7008092001**

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 have been rejected. Claims 1, 5, 8-9, and 11 have been amended.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 based on U.S. Patent No. 6,108,687 issued to Craig ("Craig") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,240,444 issued to Fin et al. ("Fin").

Craig discloses:

A system is disclosed for providing synchronized presentation of slides over a computer network. In accordance with one aspect of the invention, the system includes a plurality of computer workstations disposed in electrical communication across the computer network, each workstation running a Web browser application (e.g. Netscape's Navigator, Microsoft's Explorer, etc.). An instructor applet is executed under a browser application at a first of the plurality of computer workstations, and at least one student applet is executed under a browser application at a second of the plurality of computer workstations. Finally, a network server is provided and runs a synchronization application that is responsive to the instructor applet for managing a plurality of URLs that define the totality of the presentation. The synchronization application includes a code segment to direct each of the student applets to retrieve and display the presentation slides located at the URLs designated by the instructor and displayed via the Web browser. The display is synchronized in that the same presentation URL is displayed at the instructor workstation and each of the plurality of student workstations.

(Abstract). Craig does not disclose "computer instructions for receiving modified information from at least one of the other computers over the network, wherein said other computers and said leader computer each generally simultaneously display the modified information," as recited in claim 1 as amended.

Fin discloses:

The web sharing manager of a receiving sharing client receives duplicated events (e.g. browser requests) and messages from the web sharing manager of a source sharing client that causes the browser of the receiving sharing client to execute the duplicate event/message so that the browsers of the source and receiving

Appl. No.: 09/592,309

Amdt. dated: July 1, 2004

Reply to final Office action of March 1, 2004

PATENT

Docket No. EPI-024 US  
7008092001

sharing client computer system(s) process the same events/messages. Because events/messages, that include control and information locations (addresses), are shared between the source and receiving and sharing client(s), the same web page is simultaneously displayed and controlled, i.e. shared, on all of the sharing client(s).

(Abstract). Fin further discloses:

One or more client computer systems have a memory, one or more central processing units (CPU), an interface to a network, and a browser. A network, e.g. the Internet, provides a communication link between the one or more first (e.g. source) clients and one or more second (e.g. receiving) client computer systems using one or more Web servers. The second client(s) also has (have) a memory, a CPU(s), a network interface and a browser. In the first and second clients, the browser is capable of accessing one or more HTML pages from one or more of the Web servers by sending one or more browser requests to any one of the Web servers.

The sharing clients are one or more first and one or more second client computer systems that are collaborating with one another through their respective web sharing manager. The web sharing manager of a receiving sharing client receives the duplicated events (e.g. browser requests) and messages from the web sharing manager of a source sharing client and that causes the browser of the receiving sharing client to execute the duplicate event/messages, that include control and information locations (addresses), are shared between the source and receiving sharing client(s), the same web page is simultaneously displayed and controlled on all of the sharing client(s). Examples of events that are shared between clients include the following browser requests: location of information on the WWW, gateway connections to additional networks (including telephone networks), etc. Examples of messages include: input/output controls like mouse controls, pen controls, and keyboard input; operating system messages, and application messages.

One preferred embodiment of the invention can be added to a computer system without changing the browser or the operating system of the computer, as long as the browser has a "registration function" and the operating system has a "hooking function". The registration function causes certain events, for example CCI events, to be routed to a redirector while the hooking function permits a message redirector access to a message queue of the operating system. The registration function and hooking function work with one or more redirectors in the sharing clients to route

Appl. No.: 09/592,309  
Amdt. dated: July 1, 2004  
Reply to final Office action of March 1, 2004

**PATENT**  
**Docket No. EPI-024 US**  
**7008092001**

duplicate browser events and messages among the sharing clients  
so that the same web page appears on each of the sharing clients.

(Col. 3, lines 12-55). Fin does not disclose "computer instructions for receiving modified information from at least one of the other computers over the network, wherein said other computers and said leader computer each generally simultaneously display the modified information," as recited in claim 1 as amended.

Even if Craig and Fin were combined, the combination would neither teach nor suggest "computer instructions for receiving modified information from at least one of the other computers over the network, wherein said other computers and said leader computer each generally simultaneously display the modified information," as recited in claim 1 as amended. as recited in claim 1 as amended. Therefore, applicants submit that claim 1 as amended is patentable over Craig in view of Fin. Given that claims 2-4 depend from claim 1, as amended, applicants submit that these claims are also patentable over Craig in view of Fin.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 based on Craig in view of Fin and further in view of Using Microsoft PowerPoint 2000 by Rutledge et al., ("Rutledge").

Craig and Fin, alone or in combination, neither teach nor suggest "interactively modifying the presented information by one of the other of said plurality of participants, wherein the computer of each of said participants generally simultaneously displays the modified information," as recited in claim 5 as amended. Rutledge discloses Microsoft Power Point. Rutledge does not disclose "interactively modifying the presented information by one of the other of said plurality of participants, wherein the computer of each of said participants generally simultaneously displays the modified information," as recited in claim 5 as amended. Even if Crain, Fin and Rutledge were combined, the combination would neither teach nor suggest

Appl. No.: 09/592,309  
Amdt. dated: July 1, 2004  
Reply to final Office action of March 1, 2004

**PATENT**  
**Docket No. EPI-024 US**  
**7008092001**

“interactively modifying the presented information by one of the other of said plurality of participants, wherein the computer of each of said participants generally simultaneously displays the modified information,” as recited in claim 5 as amended. Therefore applicants submit that claim 5 as amended is patentable over Craig in view of Fin and Rutledge. Given that claims 6-7 depend from claim 5, as amended, applicants submit that these claims are also patentable.

Claim 8 stands rejected based on Craig, in view of Fin. Craig and Fin, alone or in combination, neither discloses nor suggest “interactively modifying the presented information by one of the other of said plurality of participants, wherein the computer of each of said participants generally simultaneously displays the modified information,” as recited in claim 8 as amended. Therefore, applicants submit that claim 8 is patentable over Craig in view of Fin.

Claim 9 stands rejected based on Craig, in view of Fin. Craig and Fin, alone or in combination, neither disclose nor suggest “providing a white board to allow each participant to change the display of the shared browser interface,” as recited in claim 9 as amended. Therefore, applicants submit that claim 9 is patentable over Craig in view of Fin. Given that claim 10 depends from claim 9 as amended, applicants submit that claim 10 are also patentable over Craig in view of Fin.

Claim 11 stands rejected based on Craig, in view of Fin. Craig and Fin, alone or in combination, neither discloses nor suggest “computer instructions for providing a white board to allow each participant to change the display of the shared browser interface,” as recited in claim 11 as amended. Therefore, applicants submit that claim 11 is patentable over Craig in view of Fin.

Appl. No.: 09/592,309  
Amdt. dated: July 1, 2004  
Reply to final Office action of March 1, 2004

**PATENT**  
**Docket No. EPI-024 US**  
**7008092001**

**CONCLUSION**

Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested. The Examiner may call the Assignee's attorney at the number below to further advance prosecution of this case to issuance.

DATE: July 1, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Fabio E. Marino  
Registration No. 43,339

Bingham McCutchen LLP  
Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1800  
San Francisco, California 94111  
Telephone: (650) 849-4952  
Telefax: (650) 849-4800